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To get some violations, in CX, ask:

1. What does your plan exactly do?
2. That would entail that you defend implementation right?
3. Do you defend a specific type of speech to be protected?

# Voters

## T

Fairness, debate is a competition and the judge needs to be able to non-arbitrarily determine the round winner. Education, debate is funded by educational institutions that have a constitutive obligation to teach students. Drop the debater on T: a) substance is already skewed, being forced to engage the nontopical AC puts me behind on substance, which also means T comes first: abuse in the NC was because I couldn’t use fair, topical prep b) Even if we drop your advocacy, you still lose the round because voting off anything else is functionally severance. And, vote on jurisdiction - the judge can only vote for topical cases since the ballot asks who did the better debating in context of a resolution. Use competing interps, that means an offense-defense paradigm in which defense is insufficient to win a) reasonability is arbitrary especially with definitions which carry subjective interpretations b) T is about the correct interpretation of the topic so out of round impacts matter whereas under reasonability limits arguments are irrelevant. Lastly, T can never be an RVI because the aff has the burden of being topical so winning a counter interp only shows that they’ve met the burden.

## Theory

### Tricky

Fairness, unfair arguments skew your evaluation of the round and it precedes substance because it frames its evaluation. Education is a voter since it’s the reason schools fund debate as they have an a priori commitment to teaching students. Drop the debater on neg theory: A. AC frames the debate, so if it’s abusive, then the entirety of the round is skewed and thus they lose B. Drop the arg means the aff can go for 1ar restarts, means neg always loses since the aff has a 7-6 minute advantage after the 1ar, this also means you reject 1ar theory C. 2AR collapse means neg uplayering is key, since the aff knows exactly which layers to go for since lack of a 3nr means the 2nr still has to preempt 2ar responses and cover all the layers in the debate. Use competing interps, that means an offense-defense paradigm in which the absence of a written-down counterinterp means you reject all aff args on theory a) reasonability is arbitrary – no reason why your brightline is uniquely the key to fairness or education b) reasonability just collapses into competing interps since it’s a question of whether you offense-defense meet a particular brightline.

### Fair

Fairness, unfair arguments skew your evaluation of the round and it precedes substance because it frames its evaluation. Education is a voter since it’s the reason schools fund debate as they have an a priori commitment to teaching students. Drop the debater on neg theory: A. AC frames the debate, so if it’s abusive, then the entirety of the round is skewed and thus they lose B. Drop the arg means the aff can go for 1ar restarts, means neg always loses since the aff has a 7-6 minute advantage after the 1ar C. 2AR collapse means neg uplayering is key, since the aff knows exactly which layers to go for since lack of a 3nr means the 2nr still has to preempt 2ar responses and cover all the layers in the debate. Use competing interps, that means an offense-defense paradigm in which defense is insufficient to win a) reasonability is arbitrary – no reason why your brightline is uniquely the key to fairness or education b) reasonability just collapses into competing interps since it’s a question of whether you offense-defense meet a particular brightline.

### K

Fairness, unfair arguments skew your evaluation of the round and it precedes substance because it frames its evaluation. Education is a voter since it’s the reason schools fund debate as they have an a priori commitment to teaching students. Drop the debater on neg theory: A. AC frames the debate, so if it’s flawed, then the round is skewed, no one can engage, and thus they lose B. Drop the arg means the aff can go for 1ar restarts, means neg always loses since the aff has a 7-6 minute advantage after the 1ar, this also means you reject 1ar theory. Use competing interps, that means an offense-defense paradigm in which the absence of a written-down counterinterp means you reject all aff args on theory a) reasonability is arbitrary – no reason why your brightline is uniquely the key to fairness or education b) reasonability just collapses into competing interps since it’s a question of whether you offense-defense meet a particular brightline.

## CX Doesn’t Check

1. Competing interps means it’s net preferable to have it in text rather than in CX.
2. We get education for the entire round if you spec in text rather than only when you make some sort of concession
3. Judges aren’t paying attention since they don’t have to flow CX
4. Unverifiable – you didn’t have the spike in the AC, means no one knows whether you were willing to clarify. Doesn’t matter whether you win the counterinterp since it means you don’t even meet your counterinterp.
5. It’s something we can hold you to rather than just vague concessions
6. Skews my CX time and my prep time – I think about my strat in the AC and in part of CX, which you kill.
7. Allows you to change your advocacy in CX since you can decide that some stance is better than the one you took in the AC.

## Voter Tricks

Neg T

* Jurisdiction
  + Risk of offense
  + No counter-definition means they lose

Neg Theory

* Lose if no explicit counterinterp
* Reject 1ar theory

# T - Policy Option

## General Version

**Interpretation**: The aff must defend the implementation of a specific policy option that removes restrictions on constitutionally protected speech, with a specific solvency mechanism and evidence, all in the AC.

A. **Words and Phrases**[[1]](#footnote-1) confirm “Definition of the word **“resolve,”**given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It **is** of similar force to **the word “enact,”** which is defined by Bouvier as **meaning “to establish by law”.**

B. Ought must involve a policy option since it refers to a legal relationship between an empirical condition and some legally mandated consequence. **Kelsen**:[[2]](#footnote-2)

Both cases involve simply the expression of a functional connection of elements, the connection specific to the respective system—here nature, there the law. In particular, even causality represents only a functional connection when one frees it of the metaphysico-magical sense originally attached to it by man, still entirely animistic and imagining in the cause some secret force creating, out of itself, the effect. A causal principle thus purified can never be dispensed with in the natural sciences, for what is manifest in the principle is simply the postulate of the intelligibility of nature, a postulate that can be approximated only by linking the material facts given to our cognition. Laws of nature say: ‘if A is, then £ must be.’ Positive laws say: ‘if A is, then B ought to be.’ And neither the laws of nature nor positive laws have said anything thereby about the moral or political value of the connection between A and B. The ‘ought’ designates a relative a priori category for comprehending empirical legal (p.25) data. In this respect, the ‘ought’ is indispensable, lest the specific way in which the positive law connects material facts with one another not be comprehended or expressed at all. For it is obvious that this connection is not the connection of cause and effect. It is not as the effect of a cause that punishment is set for a delict; rather, the legislator establishes between these two material facts, delict and punishment, a linkage that is completely different from causality. Completely different, but just as inviolable. For in the system of the law, that is, owing to the law, punishment follows always and without exception from the delict, even if, in the system of nature, punishment may fail to materialize for one reason or another. Where punishment does materialize, it need not occur as an effect of the delict, functioning as cause; it can have entirely different causes, even if, indeed, the delict has not taken place at all.

**And**, the neg must have a counter definition to every definition I read, otherwise they a) aren’t competitive with my interp and b) even if a definition they read is plausible in the abstract, if I have the only definition for a different word that coheres with my definition of the first word, then their definition of the first word is clearly not the appropriate one in the context of the res.

**Violation**: 1) no solvency ev or mechanism in the AC 2) no policy option 3) no implementation 4) CX

**Vote Neg**:

1. Precision: My definitions prove my interp is the most precise way of viewing the res. Prefer them a) I consider the overall context and original meaning of how people refer to ought, so I capture its context for how they’re used in the real world b) meanings constantly shift but my definitions most accurately capture their meaning. Precision’s key to jurisdiction: the judge can only vote topical affs that affirm the res.

2. Ground

A. Qualitative Ground: implementation-based neg responses are key on this topic since the topic questions whether the speech should be restricted, so absent implementation, the neg can only contest the aff’s claim that the aim is a good one – that means the aff functionally gets automatic solvency since obviously the aff’s framing means the aim is perfect, the question is whether it can actually be reached.

B. Changes to restrictions are all policies, that means that you should debate how we realize that policy and what enacting it would look like. No way for me to debate if changing speech regulations with court precedent inherently assumes some sort of policy. Means debating is incoherent – that’s an independent voter since otherwise we wouldn’t have the activity. Ground is key to fairness since you need arguments to win.

3. Real World: XXXX

Real world is key to education since it ensures the arguments we make are actually relevant. I’m the only one that allows for policy discussion since policies are about laws, that’s uniquely educational. **Keller**:[[3]](#footnote-3)

Effective policy practice involves analytic activities, such asdefining issues, gathering data, conducting research,identifying and prioritizing policy options, and creating policy proposals (Jansson, 1994). It also involves persuasive activities intended to influence opinions and outcomes, such as discussing and debating issues, organizing coalitions and task forces, and providing testimony. According to Jansson (1984, pp. 57-58), social workers rely upon five fundamental skills when pursuing policy practice activities:     \* value-clarification skills for identifying and assessing the underlying values inherent in policy positions;     \* conceptual skills for identifying and evaluating the relative merits of different policy options;     \* interactional skills for interpreting the values and positions of others and conveying one's own point of view in a convincing manner;     \* political skills for developing coalitions and developing effective strategies; and     \* position-taking skills for recommending, advocating, and defending a particular policy. These policy practice skills reflect the hallmarks of critical thinking (see Brookfield, 1987; Gambrill, 1997). The central activities of critical thinking are identifying and challenging underlying assumptions, exploring alternative[s] ways of thinking and acting, and arriving at commitments after a period of questioning, analysis, and reflection (Brookfield, 1987). Significant parallels exist with the policy-making process--identifying the values underlying policy choices, recognizing and evaluating multiple alternatives, and taking a position and advocating for its adoption. Developing policy practice skills seems to share[s] much in common with developing capacities for critical thinking.

Also, controls the internal link into predictability, if the real world gun debate is about legal restrictions then there’s no way for me to prepare for you to make other arguments that aren’t actually made in the literature. Key to fairness since you need to prepare arguments to win.

**Voter**: T

## K Version

**Interpretation**: The aff must defend the implementation of a specific policy option that removes restrictions on constitutionally protected speech, with a specific solvency mechanism and evidence, all in the AC.

A. Resolved indicates a policy option. **Parcher**:[[4]](#footnote-4)

Pardon me if I turn to a source besides Bill. American Heritage Dictionary [defines]: Resolve: [as] 1. To make a firm decision about. 2. To decide or express by formal vote. 3. To separate something into constiutent parts See Syns at \*analyze\* (emphasis in orginal) 4. Find a solution to. See Syns at \*Solve\* (emphasis in original) 5. To dispel: resolve a doubt. - n 1. Firmness of purpose; resolution. 2. A determination or decision. (2) The very nature of the word "resolution" makes it a question. American Heritage: A course of action determined or decided on. A formal statement of a decision, as by a legislature. (3) The resolution is obviously a question. Any other conclusion is utterly inconceivable. Why? Context. The debate community empowers a topic committee to write a topic for ALTERNATE side debating. The committee is not a random group of people coming together to "reserve" themselves about some issue. There is context - they are empowered by a community to do something. In their deliberations, the topic community attempts to craft a resolution which can be ANSWERED in either direction. They focus[es] on issues like ground and fairness because they know the resolution will serve as the basis for debate which will be resolved by determining the policy desirablility of that resolution. That's not only what they do, but it's what we REQUIRE them to do. We don't just send the topic committee somewhere to adopt their own group resolution. It's not the end point of a resolution adopted by a body - it's the preliminary wording of a resolution sent to others to be answered or decided upon. (4) Further context: the word resolved is used to emphasis the fact that it's policy debate. Resolved comes from the adoption of resolutions by legislative bodies. A resolution is either adopted or it is not. It's a question before a legislative body. Should this statement be adopted or not. (5) The very terms 'affirmative' and 'negative' support my view. One affirms a resolution.

**Words and Phrases**[[5]](#footnote-5) confirm “Definition of the word **“resolve,”**given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It **is** of similar force to **the word “enact,”** which is defined by Bouvier as **meaning “to establish by law”.**

B. Ought must involve a policy option since it refers to a legal relationship between an empirical condition and some legally mandated consequence. **Kelsen**:[[6]](#footnote-6)

Both cases involve simply the expression of a functional connection of elements, the connection specific to the respective system—here nature, there the law. In particular, even causality represents only a functional connection when one frees it of the metaphysico-magical sense originally attached to it by man, still entirely animistic and imagining in the cause some secret force creating, out of itself, the effect. A causal principle thus purified can never be dispensed with in the natural sciences, for what is manifest in the principle is simply the postulate of the intelligibility of nature, a postulate that can be approximated only by linking the material facts given to our cognition. Laws of nature say: ‘if A is, then £ must be.’ Positive laws say: ‘if A is, then B ought to be.’ And neither the laws of nature nor positive laws have said anything thereby about the moral or political value of the connection between A and B. The ‘ought’ designates a relative a priori category for comprehending empirical legal (p.25) data. In this respect, the ‘ought’ is indispensable, lest the specific way in which the positive law connects material facts with one another not be comprehended or expressed at all. For it is obvious that this connection is not the connection of cause and effect. It is not as the effect of a cause that punishment is set for a delict; rather, the legislator establishes between these two material facts, delict and punishment, a linkage that is completely different from causality. Completely different, but just as inviolable. For in the system of the law, that is, owing to the law, punishment follows always and without exception from the delict, even if, in the system of nature, punishment may fail to materialize for one reason or another. Where punishment does materialize, it need not occur as an effect of the delict, functioning as cause; it can have entirely different causes, even if, indeed, the delict has not taken place at all.

**And**, the neg must have a counter definition to every definition I read, otherwise they a) aren’t competitive with my interp and b) even if a definition they read is plausible in the abstract, if I have the only definition for a different word that coheres with my definition of the first word, then their definition of the first word is clearly not the appropriate one in the context of the res.

**Violation**: 1) no solvency ev or mechanism in the AC 2) no policy option 3) no implementation 4) CX

**Vote Neg**:

1. Engagement

A. Qualitative Engagement: implementation-based neg responses are key on this topic since the topic questions whether the speech should be restricted, so absent implementation, the neg can only contest the aff’s claim that the aim is a good one – that means the aff functionally gets automatic solvency since obviously the aff’s framing means the aim is perfect, the question is whether it can actually be reached.

B. Changes to restrictions are all policies, that means that you should debate how we realize that policy and what enacting it would look like. No way for me to debate if changing speech regulations with court precedent inherently assumes some sort of policy.

Engagement is an independent voter since it’s the premise of all debate, else there wouldn’t be this activity. And controls the internal link to their ROB – your impacts are premised on actually having a debate and talking about oppression. A one-way street doesn’t give us any benefits you didn’t get form writing your case at home.

2. Precision: My definitions prove my interp is the most precise way of viewing the res. Prefer them a) I consider the overall context and original meaning of how people refer to ought, so I capture its context for how they’re used in the real world b) meanings constantly shift but my definitions most accurately capture their meaning. Precision’s key to jurisdiction: the judge can only vote topical affs that affirm the res. Also controls the internal link to their ROB – you assume the judge has the jurisdiction to evaluate your aff in the first place, so even if they win their ROB, the conclusion is still that you vote on jurisdiction.

3. Limits: my interp doesn’t exclude any ground but allows for policies – critical thinking also requires examining policies, not principles in isolation – informed citizenry link turns your framing. **Harwood**:[[7]](#footnote-7)

Teaching bioethics to undergraduate students in the humanities and social sciences differs from teaching ethics to medical students or residents. One primary difference is that undergraduates are removed from the clinical setting, where a clinically-based case method of teaching is widely practiced and where students can develop their decision-making skills "at the bedside" through the mentoring of more senior physicians. Another difference is that undergraduates are not in training to join a profession, in this case a profession that has developed a fairly stable body of principles that are "applied" to real-life moral dilemmas (Jonsen, Siegler, & Winslade, 2002; Wear, 2002). Instead, as part of a liberal arts education, an undergraduate course in bioethics should aim to prepare students for life as an engaged citizen in a democratic society (Callahan & Bok, 1980; Kohlberg, 1981) by developing skills in critical thinking and encouraging active engagement in the deliberation of issues in the areas of medicine and biotechnology. Critical thinking, most plainly, is the ability to make well-considered judgments. Critical thinking involves the analysis of concepts and arguments and the interpretation of concrete data or evidence (APA, 1990); but it also requires capacities for self-criticism, moral imagination, and empathy (Momeyer, 2002). It enables the discernment of better and worse arguments or better and worse courses of action, and thus rests on the premise that such judgments of value are possible. It is an essential set of skills, not because it is immediately applicable to a chosen career, but because "wide-awake, careful, thorough habits of thinking" (Dewey, 1933, p. 274) are important in all areas of human life, both individual and social. How to Teach Bioethics One way to foster the development of critical reasoning skills in the undergraduate setting is to provide groups of students with the opportunity to research, analyze, discuss, and propose public policy on emerging topics in bioethics. This type of activity simulates the work of a national bioethics commission and encourages students to view themselves as participants in a significant public debate. For example, a group of students might study stem cell research or international research on AIDS, acquiring enough scientific, medical, and historical background on these topics to be able to identify potential ethical questions. Some questions that might be considered include: Do the benefits of stem cell research justify the use of human embryos? Are all sources of human stem cells morally equivalent? Are the existing safeguards to protect human subjects adequate for international research on AIDS? Should developing countries be able to benefit from AIDS research when their citizens serve as research subjects? Without necessarily working to achieve complete agreement, students try to reach enough of a consensus to propose a policy or regulation. A group might decide that allowing stem cell research from "leftover" embryos created in the context of in vitro fertilization is acceptable, for example, but that creating embryos for the sole purpose of research is not. Students must give reasons for their regulations; and, in searching for and articulating these reasons, students are encouraged to examine the moral values and commitments that underlie their positions. An in-class presentation of the group’s work serves as the culminating exercise, and other students are invited to challenge and contribute to the debate about what ought to be done. Students typically relish this opportunity, seeing themselves not as a passive audience to be fed neutral information but as participants in a debate that matters. In other words, they exhibit the traits of engaged citizens. These activities are highly participatory and inquiry-guided, which means the learning is driven by the task of solving a problem: devising a public policy. Students are invested in and motivated by the group’s task and discover together what they need to learn about their topic. Included in this learning process is the integration of abstract ethical theories and concepts — ideally studied throughout the entirety of the course — into the concrete details of the case at hand. It is not a matter of simply "applying" the principle of justice to the topic of international research on AIDS, for example, just for the sake of getting something done (Evans, 2000). Students must ask: what does justice look like in this case? Does conducting an experiment to see how cheaply an individual in a developing country can be treated for AIDS promote justice, as we understand it? In asking these substantive questions, students in an undergraduate bioethics course are engaged in what Callahan calls "foundational" bioethics (Callahan, 1999). They are not merely engaged in means-end reasoning: how best to achieve an already settled goal (Wear, 2002). They are examining the goals themselves, and thus considering "a multiplicity of ultimate values" (Momeyer, 2002). Developing a Wide-awake Citizenry As any teacher of undergraduate ethics can attest, this kind of substantive discussion of "ultimate values" or "the good" can be murky territory. The allure of moral relativism is strong and the resources for challenging it seem limited. As Momeyer observed, "Students frequently arrive in our classrooms with very limited ways of morally engaging problematic situations, by, for instance, appealing to religious dogmas or a relentless subjectivism and/or relativism, or by privileging – as well enculturated Americans seemingly must, – the exercise of individual autonomy over all other values"(p. 412). Regardless of how one explains the allure of relativism, what is clear is that undergraduates need to develop skills in critical thinking if they are to be able to make the well-considered judgments that are inevitable and necessary in life. One benefit of a simulated bioethics commission is that it directs students’ attention toward a problem of public policy, which is to say a problem of societal significance. Discussing classic cases in medical ethics that focus on an individual patient’s dilemma, such as, famously, whether Dax Cowart’s requests to die after suffering severe burns over most of his body should have been honored by his physicians, provide essential occasions to learn about important concepts like informed consent, competence, and respect for autonomy. Indeed, effective teaching of ethics in any setting arguably requires a dynamic balance between conceptual analysis and concrete engagement of cases. But undergraduates also need opportunities to learn that their critical thinking skills will be needed in shaping the social policies of the future. Why is critical thinking a legitimate and valuable goal? And why is active engagement or participation in shaping social policies important? As Dewey once argued, the point of education is to teach students to think on their own because conscious thinking and participation are the hallmarks of democratic citizenship. Others have followed Dewey’s pragmatic sensibilities, including the developmental psychologist, Lawrence Kohlberg, whose "just community" schools were an outgrowth of his belief that democratic participation in the making of rules for everyone in a community fosters students’ moral development. The writings of Jürgen Habermas (1995) on discourse ethics have also influenced legions of teachers to examine anew the value of a consensus-seeking dialogue that is widely inclusive and highly participatory. Conclusion If we are to avoid living in an "administered society," where we passively receive what is handed down to us from others, it is important to develop a sense of engagement in the social policies that are made and to practice the critical reasoning skills necessary to make well-considered judgments (Bellah, et al., 1991). Fortunately, continuing developments in medicine and biotechnology offer an abundance of ethical issues to debate. Teaching bioethics in the undergraduate setting is about paying attention to these debates and having a stake in their outcome.

That’s a reason to vote for me even if they win that T doesn’t come first. Limits are key to fairness since if there are too many affs I can’t get the prep I need on each one to win and to education since without specific prep I can’t engage in a debate.

**Voter**: T

# Spec

## Can’t Spec College

**Interpretation**: The aff can’t specify colleges that ought not restrict speech. To clarify, you have to defend all colleges and universities.

**Violation**: You did that, you specified \_\_ ☹

**Standards**:

1. Semantics: The resolutional phrasing means it refers to all members of the class. **Nordquist**:[[8]](#footnote-8)

Zero article with plural count nouns may have generic or indefinite reference according to the predication: [Statements like] Frogs have long hind legs. [are] (generic [and refer to]= all frogs) He catches frogs. (indefinite = an indefinite number of frogs)

Public colleges and universities is a zero article plural count noun, its not modified by any sort of quantifier or article, so Nordquist says it refers to all of them. Semantics come first:

**A.** the only possible conclusion of topicality is that semantics come prior –means your weighing for pragmatics isn’t responsive. **Nebel**:[[9]](#footnote-9)

One reason why LDers may be suspicious of my view is because they see topicality as just another theory argument. But unlike other theory arguments, topicality involves two “interpretations.” The first is an interpretation, in the ordinary sense of the word, of the resolution or of some part of it. The second is a rule—namely, that the affirmative must defend the resolution.2 If we don’t distinguish between these two interpretations, then the negative’s view is merely that the affirmative must defend whatever proposition they think should be debated, not because it is the proposition expressed by the resolution, but rather because it would be good to debate. This failure to see what is distinctive about topicality leads quickly to the pragmatic approach, by ignoring what the interpretation is supposed to be an interpretation of.

By contrast, the topicality rule—i.e., that the affirmative must defend the resolution—justifies the semantic approach. This rule is justified by appeals to fairness and education: it would be unfair to expect the negative to prepare against anything other than the resolution, because that is the only mutually acceptable basis for preparation; the educational benefits that are unique to debate stem from clash focused on a proposition determined beforehand. The inference to the priority of semantic considerations is simple. Consider the following argument:

1. We ought to debate the resolution. 2. The resolution means X.

Therefore, 3. We ought to debate X.

The first premise is just the topicality rule. The second premise is that X is the semantically correct interpretation. Pragmatic considerations for or against X do not, in themselves, support or deny this second premise. They might show that it would be better or worse if the resolution meant X, but sentences do not in general mean what it would be best for them to mean. At best, pragmatic considerations may [They] show that we should debate some proposition other than the resolution. They are (if anything) reasons to change the topic, contrary to the topicality rule. Pragmatic considerations [and] must, therefore, be weighed against the justifications for the topicality rule, not against the semantic considerations: they are objections to the first premise, not the second premise, in the argument above.

So, reasons why pragmatics are better must be made contextual to the premise that “we ought to debate the res,” not to my standard in general, else reject their pragmatics args.

**B.** everyone has access to interpretations of a fixed statement so it generates the most predictable limits which are key to our ability to equally prepare.

**C.** The text of the resolution controls the internal link to all standards about how we divide ground. Google[[10]](#footnote-10) defines “countries” as a plural noun, so they have to defend two or more countries. E.g. “Pigs fly” may be fair ground, but textuality constrains it. Means that’s key to jurisdiction – the judge can only vote for topical affs that prove the res true. Jurisdiction’s a voter since the ballot asks who did the better debating in the context of a resolution.

**D.** the judge assumes semantics as a precondition for being able to evaluate our speeches and make a decision, resolvability first because its key for the judge to decide the round.

Ground: A. you kill core generics like the endowments da or the hate speech da since the link isn’t as strong, I lose the kant nc, hate speech da and cp, and you can significantly mitigate DA and CP offense B. You’ll just cherry pick the best campus to not restrict speech on; obviously it’s intuitively true that some colleges shouldn’t restrict, like ones with certain political climates. Implies the aff gets the best ground and functionally means all neg generics wouldn’t apply. Outweighs – in my world, at least there’s a probability of engagement; in theirs’s, there’s none. Ground’s key to fairness since you need args to win.

3. Limits: You vastly underlimit the topic since you can defend a college for any of the thousands of different public ones. That exponentiates when you can also choose advantage areas and enforcement mechanisms. Limits are key to fairness since if there are too many affs I can’t get the prep I need on each one to win and to education since without specific prep I can’t engage in a debate.

Topical version of the aff solves – just defend whole res with specific college advantages – A. More breadth because we can talk about more Topical version of the aff solves – just defend whole res with specific advantages – A. More breadth because we can talk about more types of speech B. solve their depth arguments – we can talk about all speech, but you shouldn’t just get the advantage of speccing one type.

**Voter**: T Voter

### 2NR O/V

1. Their counterinterp is entirely just plans bad – means no net benefits to the counterinterp since plans are still permissible under my interp, you can choose a type of power, be it a type of reactor or what type of resource you use to create the power, just not a country.
2. Topical version of the aff solves all their offense

### AT Common Usage

1. Turn: Many policy debate theorists have concluded that semantics takes lexical priority over pragmatic concerns – this view is a pretty well-developed norm. **Nebel[[11]](#footnote-11):**

My view probably seems obvious to some people and incoherent to others. Outsiders to national circuit LD may find it ridiculous that anyone would find it necessary to defend it at such length. But some circuit LDers may think that my view rests on a conceptual confusion about topicality. **Argumentation theorists**, however, **have defended the priority of semantics in the context of CEDA**(Murphy 1994), **NPDA** (Merrell 2015), **and NFA LD**(Diers 2010) debate. Why should the view be coherent in these contexts but not in high school LD? Or do these authors simply fail to understand what topicality means? I don’t think that either hypothesis is very credible. **Murphy, Merrell, and Diers argue that pragmatic considerations are circular, unverifiable, self-undermining, subjective, non-unique, and ungrounded in argumentation theory.**

Also pragmatic concerns are not irrelevant under my interp – they are just lexically inferior to semantics. If two interps both accord with the text, then we can use standards like ground as the tiebreaker.

2. That also just begs the question of whether that common usage is correct – certain phrases we commonly use like “he is taller than me” are incorrect.

### AT Leslie

1. That just begs the question of whether that usage is correct, which Nordquist/Nebel indicates is not.

2. That still doesn’t justify speccing one type of speech – you wouldn’t say mosquitos carry West Nile Virus if there was only one that carried it, there still must be a group that carries it.

3. The Leslie evidence talks about syntax, not semantics, which means it’s totally irrelevant to the issue. **Nebel[[12]](#footnote-12):**

Not quite, I think.It's important to distinguish syntax from semantics. Leslieis say[s]ing thata variety of syntactic structures [i.e.] (bare plurals**,** indefinite singulars, definite singulars)can express generic generalizations (which is at the level of semantics**,** or meaning). "The dog is a fascinating animal" or "the tiger migrated from Asia in the third century" has a definite singular subject but is a generic generalization about the kind [of],dog or tiger; you couldn't affirm it by specifying a particular dog or tiger. It means that although the res, if generic, could have been expressed with a singular subject(as in Sept/Oct "a just society"),you still can't spec.

Impacts: a) your arguments are about sentence structure, not word meanings, which means they’re not relevant to how we interpret just governments. b) your argument only means that the res could have been expressed with a singular subject, not that you can affirm its present phrasing with a specific-country plan.

### AT SA + Disclosed

1. Reject the counterinterp on face

A. Jurisdiction: You only have the ability to vote on arguments made in-round

B. Infinite abuse: Means literally anything I do outside of the round could potentially justify an aff ballot since something I did might have marginally impacted their ability to win the round.

Impact is you vote neg automatically if I win this arg, since they’d just have floating offense not linking to anything.

2. Doesn’t answer the pragmatics argument – you might mitigate the predictability aspect but you do not solve for ground or limits. Just because you disclose or have a solvency advocate doesn’t deny that you were abusive. So, extend them –

### AT Topic Lit

1. No, that’s not topic lit, that’s just random lit that misses the actual reading of our topic.

2. Turn. Your topic lit creates irresolvable debate. Traber ’13:[[13]](#footnote-13)

Indeed, I would argue that the learning curve for really comparing empirical evidence is much steeper than the one for philosophy. Philosophy at the level we engage with in debate is challenging, but not impossible, to critique. To answer practical reason does not take an equation, and indeed, while a familiarity with the literature and method is helpful, it is not in the same sense necessary. I am sure I am not the only judge to witness a novice coming, completely on her own and just due to individual thought, to framework criticisms similar to those that more advanced debaters would have in a card. If philosophical debate seems harder, I would argue, it is only because we (as rational creatures) are capable of functioning at a much higher level of philosophy and can tell when arguments are insufficient. To understand when quantitative analysis is wrong takes serious (and may I say, often very boring) study, knowledge that most judges don’t have. Philosophy relies on arguments with claims, warrants, and implications in terms of some determined necessary standard — that is the structure of the beast and it looks familiar. Unlike policy analysis, doing philosophy in debate looks similar (if faster paced), than the way it looks in academia. We know it doesn’t look like policy analysis because there are no equations and there are no powerpoints. Empirical analysis relies on an appeal to authority because we quite credibly find a high schooler suspect when they are waxing poetic about North Korean nuclear policy. We must card an author talking about their regression analysis because it is literally inconceivable that a debater could replicate that warrant in round.

### AT Stable Advocacy

1. I just say that you must fiat all types of speech. Difference is that you fiat everything, so it’s inconceivable for anyone to shift because you can’t pick and choose.
2. Turn – specific plans solve – you can just read a plan about a specific type of speech anyway, I only limit your ability to choose a speech
3. You might be able to shift your advocacy but I know what’s best for means that’s not gonna happen

### AT Resolvability

1. Empirically disproven – judges resolve rounds with whole res affs all the time. Your arg is that the judge can literally not decide, but they can
2. Just weigh benefits of all speech versus none or between the benefits of a Belgium aff and a US DA and do clear impact calc like magnitude or probability
3. Even if resolvability outweighs, you have minimal link to it, so don’t grant them any credence on this standard, and vote neg on the other NC standards

### AT Overing (res=instance)

1. Proving one instance still isn’t sufficient – the B through D points why semantics come first disprove Overing
2. Literally no warrant why the aff can just be an instance – Overing just asserts this. Terminal defense to the card, they can never justify this because their last opportunity was last speech, no new extrapolations in the next speech. Nebel isn’t overlimiting – you can specify any nuclear power or read multiple phil or K affs.

# T – Any

## All Speech

**Interpretation**: **Cambridge Dictionary** contextualizes how we use “Any” in the English language:[[14]](#footnote-14)

Any as a determiner We use any before nouns to refer[s] to indefinite or unknown quantities or an unlimited entity: Did you bring any bread? Mr Jacobson refused to answer any questions. If I were able to travel back to any place and time in history, I would go to ancient China. Any as a determiner has two forms: a strong form and a weak form. The forms have different meanings. Weak form any: indefinite quantities We use any for indefinite quantities in questions and negative sentences. We use some in affirmative sentences: Have you got any eggs? I haven’t got any eggs. I’ve got some eggs. Not: I’ve got any eggs. We use weak form any only with uncountable nouns or with plural nouns: [talking about fuel for the car] Do I need to get any petrol? (+ uncountable noun) There aren’t any clean knives. They’re all in the dishwasher. (+ plural noun) Warning: We don’t use any with this meaning with singular countable nouns: Have you got any Italian cookery books? (or … an Italian cookery book?) Not: Have you got any Italian cookery book? Strong form any meaning ‘it does not matter which’ We use any to mean ‘it does not matter which or what’, to describe something which is not limited. We use this meaning of any with all types of nouns and usually in affirmative sentences. In speaking we often stress any: Call 0800675-437 for any information about the courses. (+ uncountable noun) When you make a late booking, you don’t know where you’re going to go, do you? It could be any destination. (+ singular countable noun) [talking about a contract for new employees] Do we have any form of agreement with new staff when they start? (+ singular countable noun) [a parent talking to a child about a picture he has painted] A: I don’t think I’ve ever seen you paint such a beautiful picture before. Gosh! Did you choose the colours? B: We could choose any colours we wanted. (+ plural countable noun)

Outweighs your definition A. first result from a well-known dictionary means it’s most likely to be correct, as opposed to speculations from pseudo-grammatical experts B. I account for both forms of any, strong and weak form, and say that both would indicate non-specification

To clarify, that implies that you must defend all types of speech, and also means that under my interp, plan-inclusive counterplans that do the entirety of the aff except a specific type of speech are illegitimate.

**Violation**: your advocacy/plan text is that you ought not restrict speech – that’s a specific type

**Vote Neg**:

1. Ground: A. you kill a core generic that can be leveraged against any aff – hate speech is the most prominent objection to reasons for campus-wide free speech, I lose the kant nc, hate speech da and cp, and you can significantly mitigate DA and CP offense B. You’ll just cherry pick the best speech to not restrict; obviously it’s intuitively true that some speech shouldn’t be restricted, like speech about racism or sexism being bad. Implies the aff gets the best ground and functionally means all neg generics wouldn’t apply. Outweighs – in my world, at least there’s a probability of engagement; in theirs’s, there’s none. Ground’s key to fairness since you need args to win.

2. Grammar: Cambridge Dictionary isn’t just a definition; it literally says that this is the proper way of using words. Implies that Cambridge is the only correct contextualization of the res, and also means counter-definitions don’t compete with mine unless they disprove Cambridge’s grammatical claim. Grammar outweighs all other standards: A. The text of the resolution controls the internal link to all standards about how we divide ground. E.g. “Pigs fly” may be fair ground, but grammar constrains it. B.everyone has access to interpretations of a fixed statement so it generates the most predictable limits which are key to our ability to equally prepare.

3. Limits: You vastly underlimit the topic since you can defend speech for any of the thousands of different types. That exponentiates when you can also choose advantage areas and enforcement mechanisms. Limits are key to fairness since if there are too many affs I can’t get the prep I need on each one to win and to education since without specific prep I can’t engage in a debate.

Topical version of the aff solves – just defend whole res with specific advantages – A. More breadth because we can talk about more types of speech B. solve their depth arguments – we can talk about all speech, but you shouldn’t just get the advantage of speccing one type.

**Voter**: T

### 2NR O/V

1. Their counterinterp is entirely just plans bad – means no net benefits to the counterinterp since plans are still permissible under my interp, you can choose a type of power, be it a type of reactor or what type of resource you use to create the power, just not a country.
2. Topical version of the aff solves all their offense – loss of ground or limits doesn’t occur if you’d just read the entirety of your aff as whole-res but with a specific advantage area or two

### AT Legal Context

multiple court rulings agree with our interp. Elder 91

Elder ‘91(David S. Elder, October 1991, "Any and All": To Use Or Not To Use?” "Plain Language' is a regular feature of the Michigan Bar Journal, edited by Joseph Kimble for the State Bar Plain English Committee. Assistant editor is George H. Hathaway. Through this column the Committee hopes to promote the use of plain English in the law. Want to contribute a plain English article? Contact Prof. Kimble at Thomas Cooley Law School, P.O. Box 13038, Lansing, MI 48901, <http://www.michbar.org/file/generalinfo/plainenglish/pdfs/91_oct.pdf> | SP)

The Michigan Supreme Court seemed to approve our dictionary definitions of "any" in Harrington v Interstate Business Men's Accident Ass'n, 210 Mich 327, 330; 178 NW 19 (1920), when it quoted Hopkins v Sanders, 172 Mich 227; 137 NW 709 (1912). The Court defined "any" like this: "In broad language, it covers 'arl'v final decree' in 'any suit at law or in chancery' in 'any circuit court.' Any' means ,every,' 'each one of all."' In a later case, the Michigan Supreme Court again held that the use of "any" in an agency contract meant "all." In Gibson v Agricultural Life Ins Co, 282 Mich 282, 284; 276 NW 450 (1937), the clause in controversy read: "14. The Company shall have, and is hereby given a first lien upon any commissions or renewals as security for any claim due or to become due to the Company from said Agent." (Emphasis added.) The Gibson court was not persuaded by the plaintiff's insistence that the word "any" meant less than "all": "Giving the wording of paragraph 14 oJ the agency contract its plain and unequivocable meaning, upon arriving at the conclusion that the sensible connotation of the word any' implies 'all' and not 'some,' the legal conclusion follows that the defendant is entitled to retain the earned renewal commissions arising from its agency contract with Gibson and cannot be held legally liable for same in this action," Gibson at 287 (quoting the trial court opinion). The Michigan Court of Appeals has similarly interpreted the word "any" as used in a Michigan statute. In McGrath v Clark, 89 Mich App 194; 280 NW2d 480 (1979), the plaintiff accepted defendant's offer of judgment. The offer said nothing about prejudgment interest. The statute the Court examined was MCL 600.6013; MSA 27A.6013: "Interest shall be allowed on any money judgment recovered in a civil action...." The Court held that "the word 'any' is to be considered all-inclusive," so the defendants were entitled to interest. McGrath at 197 Recently, the Court has again held that "[alny means 'every,' 'each one of all,' and is unlimited in its scope." Parker v Nationwide Mutual Ins Co, 188 Mich App 354, 356; 470 NW2d 416 (1991) (quoting Harrington v InterState Men's Accident Ass'n, supra)

Outweighs: A. multiple court rulings is better and more accurate B. proves how the law is actually carried out – your legal context standard is just unwarranted and generic.

Also, this means that learning about limitations is uniquely preferable since it holds higher weight in the legal system. Legal ed debates are uniquely valuable since they teach us about legal interpretation, dispute adjudication, and how to do legal research. 40% of debaters who think about their careers plan to be lawyers**[[15]](#footnote-15)**; so this outweighs other education offense since I couch the meaning of education in terms of it’s applicability to us as debaters in the future, which ensures long term value. And, solves your generic phil ed offense-we can still have normative debates about what the law should look like. Your phil ed is worse since its entirely abstracted to generic conceptions of rights, while I also allow for both abstract framing and specific applications of ethical principles.

# 1AR

## PICs Bad

**Interpretation**: The neg cannot read an CP text of \_\_\_ . To clarify, you cannot read plan-inclusive counterplans that do the entirety of the aff except for a specific type of speech/type of limiting mechanism

**Violation**: they read that CP

**Vote aff**:

There are an infinite number of types of speech and forms of limitation. You can PIC out of any facet of either, you can choose what cases the limit is based on, which constitutional violations of speech, which cases will have exceptions, and so on.

Impacts:

1. I can’t weigh the aff – you just garner benefits from the entirety of the aff save for a small issue – there are so many things to PIC out of that the PIC will just be trivially true. Kills aff turn ground since I can’t argue against the CP, and nullifies the AC since I don’t have anything to argue for in the 1AR. Also, neg gets the best args since they don’t even have to respond to the AC’s main advocacy. Ground key to fairness since it forms the args we can make, and prefer aff ground claims to neg ones since the neg can always adapt to the aff whereas the aff enters the round blind.
2. You can always derive infinite alternatives from the aff, especially with this topic since there are always things you should obvious restrict. You can also combine types of speech or limitations for infinite unpredictable advocacies. Predictability key to fairness and education since it determines the debates we have.

**Voter**: Fairness is a voter – debate’s a competition governed by rules and judges need to objectively determine the better debater. Drop the debater on 1ar theory: a) 2n has half more time than the 1a, so s/he can spread out the aff and kill any possible for the 2a to win b) the 2n can collapse to long scripts that I can never predict in the 1ar, means the 2ar is impossible. Both of this args are also reasons why there aren’t no neg RVIs since it means the 2ar can’t recover. Use competing interps: a) reasonability is arbitrary- no reason why your brightline is uniquely the key to fairness or education b) reasonability just collapses to competing interps since it’s a question of whether you offense-defense meet a brightline. Also, here’s another reason for no neg RVIs - the 2ar can never win since the 2nr will just sandbag 6 minutes of weighing, means some ability to win is key – 2nr time advantage means they can win the counterinterp even without the RVI and still win substance

## No Rights Under Util Bad

**Interpretation**: Neg can’t theoretically justify their framework and say util negates, and read resolutional offense under the framework. To clarify, you can’t \_\_\_\_

**Violation**: You do that

**Standards**:

1. Strat skew: Util negates is a nib since even if I show it’s a conceptual possibility, still have to show aff is good. The way to solve would be to read framework, but they’ve shifted it to a higher layer. That moots the entirety of the AC framework, takes away my only recourse against the NC strategy. There are always a ton of arguments why util negates, means you can generate a shit ton, I have to answer every one of them. Also, you read a [ptx DA], which is another nib I have to go through. Strat skew key to fairness

2. Resolvability: Can’t determine what offense links to the NC, so does 1AR restart under util about right to housing link, because unsure how it interacts with rights negating. Resolvability is an independent voter since you need to be able to resolve rounds before you can have debate.

**Voter**:

1. Words and Phrases Permanent Edition (Multi-volume set of judicial definitions). “Resolved”. 1964. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Pure Theory of Law, Hans Kelsen, 1934 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Keller, Whittaker, and Burke 01 [Thomas E., Asst. professor School of Social Service Administration U. of Chicago, James K., professor of Social Work, and Tracy K., doctoral student School of Social Work, “Student debates in policy courses: promoting policy practice skills and knowledge through active learning,” Journal of Social Work Education, Spr/Summer] [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Jeff. Feburary 2001. Former Debate Coach at Georgetown. <http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html>, [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Words and Phrases Permanent Edition (Multi-volume set of judicial definitions). “Resolved”. 1964. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Pure Theory of Law, Hans Kelsen, 1934 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. [(Karey, associate professor in the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies) “Teaching Bioethics through Participation and Policy-Making” Essays on Teaching Excellence Toward the Best in the Academy Vol. 16, No. 4, 2004-2005 A publication of The Professional & Organizational Development Network in Higher Education] AT [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Richard Nordquist [Ph.D. in English, is professor emeritus of rhetoric and English at Armstrong Atlantic State University and the author of two grammar and composition textbooks for college freshmen, Writing Exercises (Macmillan) and Passages: A Writer's Guide (St. Martin's Press). Richard has served as the About.com Guide to Grammar & Composition since 2006.], “zero article” about.com < http://grammar.about.com/od/tz/g/zeroarticleterm.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Nebel, Jake. “The Priority of Resolutional Semantics.” Vbriefly.com. February 2015. CS [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. https://www.google.com/search?q=countries&oq=countries&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i60l2j69i57j69i59j69i61.4119j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. [ibid] but article is entitled “The Priority of Resolutional Semantics.” 2/20/15 http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/ [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. [Facebook Chat, Screenshot: <http://cl.ly/Z3M9>. Jake Nebel, co-director of Victory Briefs, Philosophy and Marshall Scholar at Oxford University. Facebook Chat, December 19, 2014.] [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. http://nsdupdate.com/2013/in-defense-of-philosophy-by-becca-traber/ [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. “Any.” Cambridge Dictionary. <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/grammar/british-grammar/quantifiers/any> CS [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. “Gifted Tongues: High School Debate and Adolescent Culture” (2001)Gary Alan Fine.

    “Of those who had selected a career, a plurality (40 percent), planned to become lawyers.”

    Survey of over 400 students from 300 schools – 150 with people going to NFLs and 150 random not going to NFLs [↑](#footnote-ref-15)